

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 to 19, 21 to 43 are pending in the application. Claims 41 to 43 are added. Claim 20 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 6, 12, 28, and 29 are amended solely for purposes of clarity and form.

Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

In response, Applicants have amended claims 3 and 8. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 12, 18, 19, 23 to 25, 27, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,753,844 to Jones et al. (hereinafter "the Jones et al. patent").

The Jones et al. patent is directed to a disposable article for interim cleaning of hard surfaces comprising a non-woven substrate carrying an aqueous cleaning composition. The cleaning composition optionally has one or more nonionic surfactants, one or more anionic surfactants or a mixture of nonionic and anionic surfactants. The cleaning composition also has a water miscible solvent for oils and an alkalinity agent.

Claim 1 is directed to a cleaning wipe having a cleaning composition. The cleaning wipe is for cleaning carpet and

fabric. The carpet and fabric cleaning wipe has a loading level ratio about 1:1 to about 10:1, based on a total weight of the cleaning composition to a total weight of the carpet and fabric cleaning wipe.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Jones et al. patent fails to disclose or suggest a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe, let alone one having the cleaning composition, as required by claim 1. The Jones et al. patent is directed solely to a disposable article for interim cleaning of hard surfaces, such as windows and kitchen surfaces (See e.g. the Abstract and col. 1, lines 11 to 24). Claim 1 is directed to a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe. There is no disclosure or suggestion in the Jones et al. patent of a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe.

Additionally, there is no disclosure or suggestion in the Jones et al. patent of a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe having a loading level ratio, let alone the loading level ratio of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the Jones et al. patent and, thus, is in a condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 to 12, 18, 19, 23 to 25, 27, 30 and 31, which depend from claim 1, are also patentably distinguishable over the Jones et al. patent for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Thus, these claims are also in a condition for allowance.

Claim 27 depends from claim 1 and adds the element that the wipe has a textured surface, smooth surface, abrasive surface, or any combinations thereof. Applicants respectfully submit that the Jones et al. patent also fails to disclose or suggest a surface of a wipe that is a textured surface, smooth surface, or

abrasive surface. Accordingly, claim 27 is further patentably distinguishable over the Jones et al. patent.

Claims 1 to 12, 15 to 17, 20, 21, 23 to 33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by International Application Publication No. WO 98/44185 to Rogers et al. (hereinafter "the Rogers et al. application").

The Rogers et al. application is directed to an article for treating fabrics having an absorbent carrier substrate and a liquid cleaning/refreshment composition releasably absorbed in the substrate. The substrate is wholly or partly covered by a fibrous coversheet. The article is useful in an in-home process which is conducted in a clothes dryer.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Rogers et al. application fails to disclose or suggest a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe having a cleaning composition, as required by claim 1. Claim 1 provides that the cleaning composition has at least one soil resist. The soil resist is present in an amount about 0.01 wt.% to about 4 wt.% of the total weight of the composition. The Rogers et al. application does not disclose or suggest a composition or a wipe having a soil resist, let alone a soil resist present in the amount required by claim 1. Additionally, the Rogers et al. application does not disclose or suggest a wipe having a loading level ratio about 1:1 to about 10:1, based on a total weight of the cleaning composition to a total weight of the carpet and fabric cleaning wipe as discussed above with respect to claim 1. The Office Action cites the Abstract as stating about 10 grams to about 30 grams of a liquid cleaning/refreshment composition is releasably absorbed in the substrate of the Rogers et al. application. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion as to a loading level ratio of the weight of the

cleaning composition to the weight of the substrate (See definition of "loading level ratio" at page 19, lines 9 to 11 of the current application) in the Rogers et al. application. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the Rogers et al. application and, thus, is in a condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 to 12, 15 to 17, 21, 23 to 31, 33, and 35, which depend from claim 1, are also patentably distinguishable over the Rogers et al. application for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Thus, these claims are also in a condition for allowance.

Claim 16 depends from claim 1 and adds the element that the wipe further comprises at least one enhancing agent that is a hydrogen peroxide that is a high purity hydrogen peroxide. Applicants respectfully submit that the Rogers et al. application fails to disclose or suggest a high purity hydrogen peroxide. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is further patentably distinguishable over the Rogers et al. application.

Claim 21 depends from claim 1 and adds the element that the soil resist is selected from the group set forth in claim 21. Applicants respectfully submit that the Rogers et al. application fails to disclose or suggest a soil resist. The Rogers et al. application also fails to disclose or suggest a soil resist selected from the group set forth in claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is further patentably distinguishable over the Rogers et al. application.

Claim 30 depends from claim 1 and adds the element that the loading level ratio is about 2:1 to about 6:1. Applicants

respectfully submit that the Rogers et al. application fails to disclose or suggest a loading level ratio. The Rogers et al. application also fails to disclose or suggest a loading level ratio that is about 2:1 to about 6:1, as required by claim 30. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 30 is further patentably distinguishable over the Rogers et al. application.

Claim 31 depends from claim 1 and adds the element that the loading level ratio is about 3:1 to about 4.5:1. Applicants respectfully submit that the Rogers et al. application fails to disclose or suggest a loading level ratio. The Rogers et al. application also fails to disclose or suggest a loading level ratio that is about 2:1 to about 6:1, as required by claim 31. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 31 is further patentably distinguishable over the Rogers et al. application.

Claim 20 is cancelled. Thus, the rejection of this claim is moot.

Claim 32 is directed to a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe having a cleaning composition, the cleaning composition having about 0.01 wt.% to about 4 wt.% soil resist. The carpet and fabric cleaning wipe has a loading level ratio about 1:1 to about 10:1, based on a total weight of the cleaning composition to a total weight of the carpet and fabric cleaning wipe.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Rogers et al. application fails to disclose or suggest a cleaning wipe having a cleaning composition, as required by claim 32. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the Rogers et al. application does not disclose or suggest a soil resist. Also, the Rogers et al.

application does not disclose or suggest a soil resist present in the amount required by claim 32. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 32 is patentably distinguishable over the Rogers et al. application and, thus, is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 17 and 32 to 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Jones et al. patent. Claims 17 and 33 to 40 depend from claim 1. Thus, they are also directed to a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe having a cleaning composition. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the Jones et al. patent fails to disclose or suggest a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe, as required by each of claims 17 and 33 to 40. Further, the Jones et al. patent fails to disclose or suggest a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe having a loading level ratio, let alone a loading level ratio as required by claims 17 and 33 to 40. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 17 and 33 to 40 are patentably distinguishable over the Jones et al. patent and, thus, are in a condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Jones et al. patent fails to disclose or suggest a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe having a cleaning composition, as required by claim 32. Specifically, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, the Jones et al. patent is directed solely to a disposable article for interim cleaning of hard surfaces, such as windows and kitchen surfaces. There is no disclosure or suggestion in the Jones et al. patent of a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe. Additionally, there is no disclosure or suggestion in the Jones et al. patent of a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe having a loading level ratio, let alone the loading level ratio of claim 32. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 32 is

patentably distinguishable over the Jones et al. patent and, thus, is in a condition for allowance.

Claim 33 is directed to a method of producing the cleaning wipe of claim 1. The method has the steps of (a) placing the wipe in a container, (b) dispensing the composition into the container, and (c) sealing the container. Applicants respectfully submit that the Jones et al. patent fails to disclose or suggest placing the wipe in a container and then dispensing the composition into the container. In fact, the Jones et al. application only discloses a pre-moistened substrate being packaged in a container. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 33 and claims 34 to 35, which depend from claim 33, are further patentably distinguishable over the Jones et al. application.

Claim 36 is directed to a method of producing the cleaning wipe of claim 1. The method has the steps of (a) dispensing the composition into a container, (b) placing the wipe into the container, and (c) sealing the container. Applicants respectfully submit that the Jones et al. patent fails to disclose or suggest dispensing a composition into a container and then placing the wipes into the container. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 36 and claims 37 to 38, which depend from claim 36, are further patentably distinguishable over the Jones et al. application.

Claims 39 and 40 are directed to methods of producing the cleaning wipe of claim 1. Each of claims 39 and 40 require the step of (a) spraying the composition onto the wipe. Applicants respectfully submit that the Jones et al. patent fails to disclose or suggest spraying a composition onto a wipe. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 39 and 40

are further patentably distinguishable over the Jones et al. application.

Claims 1 to 21, and 30 to 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over International Application Publication No. WO 99/19441 to Raso et al. (hereinafter "the Raso et al. application").

The Raso et al. application is directed to a cleaning and disinfecting composition that provides effective cleaning, disinfecting and shine performance on surfaces, especially hard surfaces.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Raso et al. application fails to disclose or suggest a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe having a cleaning composition, as required by claim 1. The Raso et al. application does not disclose or suggest a soil resist. The Office Action cites the optional soil suspenders of the Raso et al. application. However, a soil suspender is not a soil resist. A soil suspender supports the soil in the composition making it easier to remove the soil from the surface being cleaned. A soil resist provides a treatment to the surface being cleaned that retards the resoiling of the surface. There is no disclosure or suggestion of a soil resist in the Raso et al. application, let alone a soil resist present in the amount of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the Raso et al. application and, thus, is in a condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 to 19, 21, 30, and 31, which depend from claim 1, are also patentably distinguishable over the Raso et al. application for at least the



reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 and, thus, are in a condition for allowance.

Claim 16 depends from claim 1 and adds the element that the wipe further comprises at least one enhancing agent that is a hydrogen peroxide that is a high purity hydrogen peroxide. Applicants respectfully submit that the Raso et al. application fails to disclose or suggest a high purity hydrogen peroxide. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is further patentably distinguishable over the Raso et al. application.

Claim 20 is cancelled. Thus, the rejection of this claim is moot.

Claim 21 depends from claim 1 and adds the element that the soil resist is selected from the group set forth in claim 21. Applicants respectfully submit that the Raso et al. application fails to disclose or suggest a soil resist. The Raso et al. application also fails to disclose or suggest a soil resist selected from the group set forth in claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is further patentably distinguishable over the Raso et al. application.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Raso et al. application fails to disclose or suggest a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe having a cleaning composition, as required by claim 32. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the Raso et al. application does not disclose or suggest a soil resist, as required by claim 32, let alone a soil resist present in the amount set forth in claim 32. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 32 is patentably distinguishable

over the Raso et al. application and, thus, is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 1 to 14, 17 to 27, and 30 to 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over International Application Publication No. WO 00/30956 (hereinafter "the '956 application"). The '956 application is directed to a dispensing system for wet wipes for use in wiping surfaces in the home and in industry, in addition to their use on the human body, such as for baby wipes, make-up removal and other skin care application.

Applicants respectfully submit that the '956 application fails to disclose or suggest a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe having a cleaning composition, as required by claim 1. The '956 application does not disclose or suggest a composition or a wipe having a soil resist, as required by claim 1. The Office Action cites the optional substrate treatment with fluorinated materials like fluoropolymers in the '956 application. However, the fluorinated materials are used in the '956 application to treat the substrate to adapt the separation force between wipes (page 12, line 27). As discussed above, a soil resist is a material that treats the surface to be cleaned to retard resoiling of that surface. The fluoropolymers of the '956 patent are treatments for the substrate itself. Further, the '956 application does not disclose or suggest a concentration or an amount for the use of the fluoropolymers or a soil resist. Accordingly, the '956 application does not disclose or suggest a soil resist, let alone a soil resist present in the amount required by claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the '956 application and, thus, is in a condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 to 14, 17 to 19, 21 to 27, 30, 31, and 33 to 40, which depend from claim 1, are also patentably distinguishable over the '956 application for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 and, thus, are in a condition for allowance.

Claim 18 depends from claim 1 and adds the element that the wipe further has at least one enhancing agent that is an alcohol selected from the group set forth in claim 18. Applicants respectfully submit that the '956 application fails to disclose or suggest an alcohol selected from the group set forth in claim 18. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 is further patentably distinguishable over the '956 application.

Claim 19 depends from claim 1 and adds the element that the wipe further has at least one enhancing agent that is an alcohol present in an amount about 1 wt.% to about 20 wt.% of the total weight of the composition. Applicants respectfully submit that the '956 application fails to disclose or suggest any specific amount of an alcohol present. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 is further patentably distinguishable over the '956 application.

Claim 20 is cancelled. Thus, the rejection of this claim is moot.

Claim 21 depends from claim 1 and adds the element that the soil resist is selected from the group set forth in claim 21. Applicants respectfully submit that, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, the '956 et al. application fails to disclose or suggest a soil resist. The '956 et al. application also fails to disclose or suggest a soil resist selected from the group set forth in claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit

that claim 21 is further patentably distinguishable over the '956 et al. application.

Claim 22 depends from claim 1 and adds the element that the soil resist is selected from the group set forth in claim 22. Applicants respectfully submit that, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, the '956 et al. application fails to disclose or suggest a soil resist. The '956 et al. application also fails to disclose or suggest a soil resist selected from the group set forth in claim 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 is further patentably distinguishable over the '956 et al. application.

Claim 30 depends from claim 1 and adds the element that the loading level ratio is about 2:1 to about 6:1. Applicants respectfully submit that the '956 application fails to disclose or suggest a loading level ratio. The '956 application also fails to disclose or suggest a loading level ratio that is about 2:1 to about 6:1, as required by claim 30. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 30 is further patentably distinguishable over the '956 application.

Claim 31 depends from claim 1 and adds the element that the loading level ratio is about 3:1 to about 4.5:1. Applicants respectfully submit that the '956 application fails to disclose or suggest a loading level ratio. The '956 application also fails to disclose or suggest a loading level ratio that is about 2:1 to about 6:1, as required by claim 31. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 31 is further patentably distinguishable over the '956 application.

Applicants respectfully submit that the '956 application fails to disclose or suggest a carpet and fabric cleaning wipe


having a cleaning composition, as required by claim 32.

Specifically, the '956 application does not disclose or suggest a composition or a wipe having a soil resist, let alone a soil resist present in the amount required by claim 32. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 32 is patentably distinguishable over the '956 application and, thus, is in a condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the cited prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and the passage of all claims to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

February 2, 2003



Charles N.J. Ruggiero  
Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 28,468

Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero  
& Perle, L.L.P.

One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford CT 06901-2682

Tel: 203-327-4500

Fax: 203-327-6401